

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 21 has been Canceled.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-12, 14-16, 19-23, 25-27, and 30-31 as being anticipated by LeCrone, et al. (US 7,117,386). Claims , 2, 4-6, 9-12, 14-16, 19-23, 25-27, and 30-31 have been Canceled.

The Examiner has objected to claims 3, 7, 8, 13, 17, 18, 24, 28, and 29 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3 has been written in independent form including all the limitations of claims 1 and 2. Claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of claims 1, 5 and 6. Claim 8 in original form is now properly dependent on amended claim 7. Claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of claims 11 and 12. Claim 17 has been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of claims 11, 15, and 16. Claim 18 in original form is now properly dependent on amended claim 17. Claim 24 has been rewritten in independent form including the limitations of claims 22 and 23. Claim 28 has been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of claims 22, 26, and 27. Claim 29 in original form is now properly dependent on claim 28.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that claims 3, 7, 8, 13, 17, 18, 24, 28, and 29 are now in condition of allowance and respectfully request reconsideration. Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful examination of the original claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Xiaonan Ma, et al.

/Lewis Nunnelley/

Reg. No. 42,942